



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,067	07/14/2003	Robert Douglas Christiansen	100204030-1	7123
22879 7590 12/08/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER				
KASSA, HILINA S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/08/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/620,067

**Applicant(s)**CHRISTIANSEN, ROBERT  
DOUGLAS**Examiner**

HILINA S. KASSA

**Art Unit**

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment submitted on 08/22/2008 has been acknowledged. Claims 1-22 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Schoenzeit nor Neuhard disclose "requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager processor preference"

With respect to Applicant's argument "requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager processor preference", According to Applicant's specification the word "parameter" refers to print job and/or default values, download address, etc as shown in 120 of figure 1. Also, the meaning of "Dynamic" is characterized by continuous change as referred from [www.dictionary.com](http://www.dictionary.com) and the word "configuration" is the way in which something is set up (taken from applicant's argument on page 9, paragraph [0002]).

According to the [www.dictionary.com](http://www.dictionary.com) the definition of the word "congruent" means in agreement or in accordant or coinciding. Having to list the definitions of some terminologies, **First:** Applicant argues that "there is no configuration being performed". Per the argument, it is stated in the Neuhard reference that the Print MPC server generates (dynamically configured, since the generation is the continuous change of setup i.e. generation of the RIP versions) the RIP versions of the items (column 13, line 45). **Second:** it is argued that the "neither the print job nor the Ripped version of the print job can be considered as a parameter" (taken from applicant's response on page 10, paragraph [0001]). But as stated above and in applicant's specification, the word parameter refers to print job and/or default values, download address, etc as shown in 120 of figure 1. **Third:** it is argued that there is no RIPing parameter disclosed (taken from applicant's response on page 10, paragraph [0002]). But as it is also stated in the applicant's argument on page 9, paragraph [0001], Neuhard does disclose that after a print job (is considered as the parameter according to the second argument) is submitted it is determined whether a Ripped version of the print job is available by checking in the directory containing the RIP files (column 13, lines 36-39). **Four:** it is argued that there is no processor preference taught in the reference. However, according to paragraph [0045] of applicant's specification, the processing preference is represented as one or more parameters (e.g. a RIPing algorithm, software version, a font design a font version, and/or other configurable RIP engine parameters as specified in the RIPing parameters).

Having said that, the processor preferences are represented by the RIPed version of the print jobs (column 13, lines 36-42). **Five:** it is argued that the preference is supplied by a RIP manger. As stated in the fourth argument's response, the preference is considered with in the context of the claim language as "RIP manager supplied processing preference". Also, it is not in the claim language that the preference is supplied by a RIP manager. Thus, the stated arguments are not persuasive and are specifically taught by Neuhard et al. reference.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 14, 16-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) in view of Neuhard et al. (US Patent Number 6,052,198).

#### **(1) regarding claim 1:**

As described in figures 1-6, Schoenzeit et al. disclose a networked computing environment (column 4, lines 30-36, 47-56; **note that a computer network configuration is illustrated**) including a Raster Image Process (RIP) manager coupled

to at least one RIP engine (**42, 40a-40c, figure 3; column 5, lines 35-38; note that the graphic image server 14 manages the flow of graphic files and rasterized image data**), a method for the RIP manager to automatically configure the RIP engine (**column 5, lines 53-64; note that the output devices include RIP in order to rasterize the print job based on the designated module without manual set up or an operator**), the method comprising:

receiving a print job (**column 5, lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the received job is a graphic image file which gets RIPPed in order to be printed**); and  
the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-column 10, line 2**).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPPed version is submitted or available if not, the RIPPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer**).

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

**(2) regarding claim 2:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one RIPing parameter is a RIPing algorithm, a resource/software version, a particular font, or a color profile (**column 5, line 60-column 6, line1; note that software versions is considered**).

**(3) regarding claim 3:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline (**54a, 54b, figure 3**)  
wherein the first and second RIP engines are heterogeneous with respect to one another (**column 7, lines 55-62**); and

wherein requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration is further directed to configuring the first RIP engine to process the particular portion using same RIPing parameters as used by the second RIP engine to RIP a different portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 57-62; note that each RIP can process different portions of the image file**).

**(4) regarding claim 4:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises downloading, by the RIP engine, any configuration resource(s) indicated by RIP manager supplied processing preference(s) that are not locally available to the RIP engine (**column 5, lines 20-24; note that different software gets either stored to a disc or transferred/loaded from host computer**).

**(5) regarding claim 6:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises: directing the RIP engine to communicate a status to the RIP manager indicating whether the RIP engine can perform the dynamic configuration in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 6, lines 5-18; note that each file contained in the RIP queues and output include status identification**); and

wherein the status determines whether the RIP engine or a different RIP engine in the pipeline will RIP the particular portion (**column 6, lines 14-18**).



**(6) regarding claim 7:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the status is a response message or a lapse of time (**column 6, lines 5-18; note that for each status there is a message**).

**(7) regarding claim 9:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the method further comprises:  
determining that the RIP engine can successfully RIP the print job in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 7, lines 55-59**); and  
responsive to the determining, communicating the particular portion to the RIP engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 7, lines 21-29**).

**(8) regarding claim 10:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computer-readable medium having computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine stored thereon (**column 5, lines 53-64; note that the output devices include RIP in order to rasterize the print job based on the designated module without manual set up or an operator**), the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

evaluating a print job to identify a set of RIPing parameters (**column 5, lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the received job is a graphic image file which gets RIPPed in order to be printed**);

communicating the RIPing parameters to a RIP engine to direct the RIP engine to automatically configure its RIPing operations to conform to the RIPing parameters (**column 6, lines 19-28**),

the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-column 10, line 2**).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPPed version is submitted or available if not, the RIPPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer**).

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

**(9) regarding claim 11 and 18:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the RIPing parameters indicate one or more specific RIPing algorithms, font resources, color profiles, and/or software versions (column 5, line 60-column 6, line1; note that software versions is considered).

**(10) regarding claim 14:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for directing the RIP engine to RIP at least a portion of a print job using resource(s) associated with the RIPing parameters (column 7, lines 55-62).

**(11) regarding claim 16:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a raster image processor (RIP) manager computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-program instructions recited in claim 10 (column 4, lines 44-56; note that the RIP manger is

**considered as the graphic image server which graphic images got created by personal computer and communicated).**

**(12) regarding claim 17:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computer-readable media comprising computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine coupled to a RIP manager (**column 5, lines 53-64; note that the output devices include RIP in order to rasterize the print job based on the designated module without manual set up or an operator**), the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

receiving, by the RIP engine, a request to configure RIPing operations in accordance with one or more parameters specified by the RIP manager (**column 5, lines 48-50; column 6, lines 1-4; note that the received job is a graphic image file which gets RIPed in order to be printed**); and

responsive to receiving the request, the RIP engine configuring RIPing operations based on the one or more parameters (**column 6, lines 19-28**), and

the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 7, lines 55-62; column 9, line 63-column 10, line 2**).

Schoenzeit et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of

at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference.

However, as shown in figure 13, Neuhard et al. discloses requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference **(152, 156, 158, 168, figure 13; column 13, lines 31-45; note that after the print job is submitted it gets checked whether the RIPed version is submitted or available if not, the RIPed version gets generated and submitted to the printer).**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. static processing presentation for printer data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to reduce the complexity of processing the print jobs (column 2, lines 29-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. with Neuhard et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

**(13) regarding claim 22:**

Schoenzeit et al. further disclose, a computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17 **(column 4, lines 44-53).**

5. Claims 8, 12, 13, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) and Neuhard et al. (US Patent Number 6,052,198) and further in view of Berry et al. (US Patent Number 6,707,563 B1).

**(1) regarding claim 12:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters.

However, Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters (**column 14, lines 50-67; column 15, lines 1-5; note that the black and white printing parameter is supplemented by color printing**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method efficient (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

**(2) regarding claim 13:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters; responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations.

However, Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for: receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters (**column 10, lines 16-24; note that the color verses black and white configuration is considered as the subset of parameters**); and responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations (**column 10, lines 25-31**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art receiving a download request from the

RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters; responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method efficient (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. , Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

**(3) regarding claims 8 and 15:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline, determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters; responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters; and communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine.

However, Berry et al. disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline (**column 10, lines 1-6**), and wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for:



determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters (**column 10, lines 11-16**);

responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters (**column 10, lines 16-24**); and

communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine (**column 10, lines 25-34; note that the engine arranges the color and black and white configurations**).

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline, determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters; responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters; and communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method efficient and reliable (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

**(4) regarding claim 21:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address; and responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager.

Berry et al. disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address **(column 10, lines 11-16; note that when there is a problem configuring one or more parameters, the print engines are reconfigured to different engines depending on the need to print the job)**; and responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager **(column 10, lines 16-31; column 12, lines 24-32)**.

Schoenzeit et al., Neuhard et al. and Berry et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for: determining that computer resources of the

RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address; and responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to make the method efficient and reliable (column 1, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. with Berry et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

6. Claims 5 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenzeit et al. (US Patent Number 5,619,624) and Neuhard et al. (US Patent Number 6,052,198) further in view of Eisele (US Publication Number 2002/0109869 A1).

**(1) regarding claims 5 and 19:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager.

However, Eisele discloses wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager (**paragraph 3, lines 3-8**).

It is desirable to have the RIP engine download settings from a network. This is because it is reliable and faster to use. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method as taught by Eisele, in which the RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager, into the method of Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhaard et al., because such a feature is faster and more reliable to be used.

**(2) regarding claim 20:**

Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhaard et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching, wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine.

However, Eisele discloses wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine (**paragraph 29, lines 4-9**).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method as taught by Eisele, in which the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine, into the method of Schoenzeit et al. and Neuhaard et al., because such a feature is easier to be utilized from the local engine than the network address.

***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pari-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Art Unit: 2625

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625  
December 1, 2008

/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625